THE
Dan Smoot Report

Vol. 16, No. 36 (Broadcast 785) September 7, 1970 Dallas, Texas

DAN SMOOT

BILLIONS FOR WHAT?

Speaker of the House John McCormack says that President Nixon would not dare veto an aid-to-education bill in a year when *Nixon* is a candidate.(1) He means that the enormous power of the education lobby gives a sharp edge to the National Education Association (NEA) threat to "put the fear of God" into politicians who defy NEA demands.(1)

Thus, McCormack reveals that self interest is the essential motivation of politicians who plunder taxpayers for federal-aid programs. They squander tax money primarily to buy political support for themselves, while piously pretending their purpose is to educate youth, help the poor, and so on.

But politicians can never spend enough tax money to placate lobbyists.

The education lobbyists, in particular, use propaganda so false and vicious that it tends to leave honest people sputtering incoherently. The education lobbyists consistently imply (or directly say) that anyone who resists any of their demands hates children and is opposed to education.

In both the 1970 and 1971 fiscal years, congressional appropriations for education far exceeded the President's own excessive recommendations. Yet, the NEA president implied that inadequate spending on education is denying "the right of every child to be given an equal chance to grow," and declared that the education lobby "must elect a Congress that will vote aid to education."(1)

And, of course, the education lobbyists (like all other lobbyists for unconstitutional domestic programs that serve the interest of special groups) accuse the federal government of putting so much tax money into the "industrial-military complex" (contemporary liberal jargon for *national defense*) that it neglects "social programs" (illegal federal subsidies for welfare, education, "health," poverty war, and so on).

What is the *truth* about federal spending?

Between 1948 and 1950, annual outlays for national defense were less than $13 billion. They in-

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT is published weekly by The Dan Smoot Report, Inc., Box 9538, Dallas, Texas 75214 (office at 6441 Gaston Ave.). Subscriptions: $18.00 for 2 years; $10.00, 1 year; $6.00, 6 months. Dan Smoot was born in Missouri, reared in Texas. With BA and MA degrees from SMU (1938 and 1940), he joined the Harvard faculty (1941) as a Teaching Fellow, doing graduate work in American civilization. From 1942 to 1951, he was an FBI agent; from 1951 to 1955, a commentator on national radio and television. In 1955, he started his present independent, free-enterprise business: publishing this REPORT and abbreviating it each week for radio and TV broadcasts available for commercial sponsorship by business firms.

Copyright by Dan Smoot, 1970. Second Class mail privilege authorized at Dallas, Texas.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

creased with the Korean war, rising to $50 billion in 1953. Since 1953, defense expenditures (including all outlays for the Vietnam war) have increased 49% — which just about equals price increases resulting from inflation. During that same period, federal expenditures on social programs increased 944%. Education got a lion's share of that increase.[2]

Other comparative measurements:

—Defense spending was 64% of federal expenditures in 1953, 36% in fiscal 1971. Spending for social purposes was 9% of all federal expenditures in 1953, 36% in fiscal 1971.

—Annual defense spending increased $24.2 billion from 1953 to fiscal year 1971; annual federal spending on social programs increased $67.2 billion.[2]

These statistics are on *federal* spending. *All* defense spending is federal, but federal spending on social programs is only a fraction of the total tax money spent. Federal spending on education alone presently totals about $12 billion a year;[1] and that does not include more than $800 million a year that the federal government spends on the school lunch program ($684 million authorized for fiscal 1971)[3] and on the special milk program ($120 million authorized for fiscal 1971).[3] Yet, federal spending is only 8% of the total of all tax money spent on education.[2]

Currently, 40% of every dollar spent by state and local governments goes to public schools.[4] More than 50% of the property taxes levied by local governments goes to public schools.[5] This means that more than half of the taxes you pay on your home goes to public schools, whether you have children in the schools or not. If you live in an apartment, a good portion of your rent goes to reimburse the landlord for school taxes he pays on the apartment building.

Between 1950 and 1970, public school enrollment increased 88% (from 25 million pupils to 47 million).[2] In the same period, the instructional staff increased 131%,[2] and annual tax spending increased from $209 per-pupil to $623 per-pupil[5] — a total increase of about 600% in tax spending on public schools in 20 years. Overall tax spending on public schools and colleges in that period increased about 700%.[2]

In this same period, expenditures of the American people on personal consumption, personal investments, and business investments increased about 200%.[2]

With only 6% of the world's population, the American people now invest annually in educational institutions almost as much as all other people on earth.[2]

Compare these facts about what Americans spend on education with the dishonest propaganda of the education lobbyists. In September, 1968, Mrs. Elizabeth D. Koontz (then president of NEA, now an official in the Nixon administration) went to Detroit to support a teachers strike. "Sock it to 'em, Teach" was the battle cry of the NEA under her presidency, and it was the theme of her speech to striking Detroit teachers. She said that teachers must be organized into a powerful political force, because, she said:

"Education cannot continue to get only what is left of community resources after all other programs are funded."[6]

What are we getting for the staggering sums of tax money spent on the most expensive and extensive educational system in the history of the world?

In the 1950's, when the anti-communist, anti-socialist movement in the United States was beginning to show some vigor, liberals — always virulently intolerant of any views except their own — were hysterical about criticisms of liberal policies. Those policies were established, and for the most part administered, by members of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) or by members of other tax-exempt organizations interlocked with the CFR to form the invisible government of the United States.[7]

Liberal policies had involved us in World War

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II, and had then given to communists the fruits of our military victory in that war.

Liberals had initiated programs to give American money and goods away to foreign nations, as if in compliance with Joseph Stalin's plan for redistributing the wealth of all nations until the advanced industrialized nations (meaning specifically the U. S.) would be brought down to a level — and the undeveloped, non-industrial nations would be brought up to a level — which would facilitate the merger of all nations into a one-world dictatorship of the proletariat.

Liberals had initiated economic policies which were giving away to the rest of the world the great American gold reserve,[7] thus debauching our currency and putting our monetary system at the mercy of foreign banks and governments which were accumulating claims on our gold reserve many times greater than the value of all gold we had left in that reserve.

As if in compliance with Lenin's scheme of inducing capitalist nations to spend themselves into bankruptcy, liberals had initiated federal-spending programs which, by the mid-1950's, were piling up a national debt greater than the combined indebtedness of all other nations on earth — greater, by far, than the assessed value of all property, real and personal, in the United States. Liberals had initiated policies which involved the United States in every war or border clash on earth, putting us in the position of helping finance both sides of every conflict, thus buying for us the hatred of all and draining our economic resources. These same policies have kept us from building adequate defense for our homeland.

Having perceived that the United States could never be converted into a socialist state as long as our constitutional system limited federal power, and dispersed most of the powers of government among the states, socialists, early in this century, began propaganda for programs that would undermine the authority and financial resources of the states, while concentrating economic and political power in the central government. By the mid-1950's, socialist programs sponsored by liberals (both Democrat and Republican) had put us well on the way toward the socialist goal of transforming the free republic of united states into a homogenized autocracy, with political and economic power consolidated in the central government at Washington.

It would seem that such liberal policies would be most vulnerable to criticism; and so they were, despite the fact that liberals in the 1950's had had for almost 20 years (as they still have) a virtual monopoly on the mass news media.

It was their *vulnerability* that caused frenzy among liberals in the mid-1950's when they became aware that constitutional conservatism (anti-socialism, anti-communism, anti-fascism, anti-collectivism, anti-big-government) was becoming a strong national movement. A leading liberal politician of that time was Joseph Clark, then U. S. Senator from Pennsylvania. Calmer and more perceptive than some, Senator Clark spoke words of comfort to his frantic fellow liberals. He told them not to worry. He predicted that if one more full generation of Americans could be conditioned ("educated" is the word Senator Clark used) in the public schools, liberalism would be safely, ineradicably entrenched in the American mind.

Was he right? You could answer that question by making your own survey. Talk to 100 high school graduates under the age of 30.

You will find most of them dissatisfied with operations of the federal government. They will complain about excessive taxation and inflation. Many will denounce the waste, extravagance, inefficiency, stupidity, favoritism, and corruption involved in massive federal spending programs. But about 98 of the 100 would approve of the programs if they were correctly handled. Even those who consider themselves conservative will say: "Of course the federal government has a responsibility to take care of the poor who cannot take care of themselves;" and they will be shocked if you tell them the federal government has no constitutional authority to take care of the poor — that the only valid governmental authority and responsibility for taking care of the poor rest with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

state and local governments. Some of them will counter with the pragmatic argument that state and local governments do not have enough revenue for adequate welfare; and they will look at you with blank incomprehension if you explain that state and local governments could have enough revenue for *legal* programs if the federal government did not take so much of it for *illegal* programs.

Of the 100 under-thirty high school graduates you interview, most will probably express opposition to the federal government's forced-integration-by-busing policies which are causing chaos in many school systems, creating racial hatreds and violence instead of mutual understanding and respect among the races, debasing (in some places utterly eliminating) education in the schools, making school children guinea pigs for social experimenters and pawns for political panderers, and adding frightfully to the already-frightful cost of the public schools. But most of the 100 will nonetheless claim that the federal government should provide money to help operate the public schools. Few of them will understand if you explain that the federal government has no constitutional authority to provide any such aid.

Some of the high school graduates you interview (if you select them at random) will be hostile because America has not yet gone far enough into socialism. A few years ago, a survey in three large midwestern universities revealed that 53% of students interviewed favored government ownership of banks, railroads, and steel companies; 61% considered profit unnecessary for the survival of free enterprise.[8]

In short, our costly system of public education has left a generation of Americans largely ignorant of the fundamental economic and political principles on which our nation was built. It has also done a dismal job in giving children the elementary skills necessary for acquiring education — that is, in teaching youngsters to read, write, and figure. A 12-nation survey (financed in part by the U. S. Office of Education) revealed that U. S. schools rate tenth place in the teaching of mathematics.[9] An appalling number of American high school graduates today are virtually illiterate: they have a spelling vocabulary smaller than what should be required of a second grader; they cannot write an intelligible sentence; and they can barely read.

The education lobby — especially the National Education Association — has heavy responsibility not only for the tremendous costs, but also for the costly failure, of public education in the United States.

NEXT WEEK: A little more about the NEA, and some suggestions

FOOTNOTES

(1) *Dan Smoot Report*, Aug. 31, 1970

(2) "Crisis In American Education," June 19, 1970, speech by Roger A. Freeman, Special Assistant to the President of the United States

(3) *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, May 8, 1970, p. 1216; July 3, p. 1708

(4) *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, March 6, 1970, p. 716

(5) *U.S. News & World Report*, Aug. 24, 1970, pp. 14-16

(6) *Wall Street Journal*, Sept. 13, 1968, p. 8

(7) *The Invisible Government*, by Dan Smoot — $1.00 pocketbook; $4.00 library binding

(8) "The Subtle Suicide of Private Enterprise," November, 1969, speech by Dr. John A. Howard, president of Rockford College

(9) *U.S. News & World Report*, March 20, 1967, p. 12

Subscribe Today to The Dan Smoot Report

6 mos. $6.00 **– 1 YR. $10.00 –** 2 yrs. $18.00

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT
BOX 9538, DALLAS, TEXAS 75214
Telephone: TAylor 1-2303

Send reprints to your friends and suggest they order reprints too.
REPRINTS OF THIS ISSUE (for bulk mailing to one address):

1 copy	$ .25	100 copies	$ 6.50
10 copies	1.00	200 copies	12.00
25 copies	2.00	500 copies	28.00
50 copies	3.50	1000 copies	50.00

Texans Add 4¼% for Sales Tax
(Add 50c for special-handling postage)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED